

Utility Patent
Ser. No. 09/921,375

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed July 31st, 2007 has been received and reviewed. By the present Response and Amendment, Claims 12 and 13 are pending and amended. No new matter is introduced.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention.

Applicant amends the claim to place it in condition for allowance. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 12 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,915,020 to Tilford et al. In view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,141,062 to Hall et al. and U.S. Pat. No. 5,428,671 to Dykes et al.

Applicant firstly contends that Tilford cannot be considered a reference in the combination for Independent Claim 12 because it fails to teach the elements as cited by Examiner.

Tilford teaches a video camera 123 fitted within an enclosure case of a portable

**Utility Patent
Ser. No. 09/921,375**

device (col. 13, ll. 50-51). Tilford shows the camera *fixed* within the enclosure (FIG. 8). Nowhere is it taught to comprise a *swivel* capability. Applicant rather claims a swivel feature to the camera.

Tilford teaches a buffer within a transport IC 68 (col. 11, ll. 65-68). The buffer stores output passed to the transport IC from an inverse forward correction block 66 (FEC-⁻¹). The FEC-⁻¹ receives a bitstream downconverted from a tuner/demodulator 62 (col. 11, ll. 50-65; FIG. 7). Applicant alternatively claims an input *buffer coupled between a series* of amplifiers and a network switching element. Nowhere in Tilford is a buffer taught or suggested either coupled to or between the Feed LNB 41 and the tuner/modulator 62. Applicant contends the varied placements of the buffers in both Tilford and Applicant's inventions cause a method for signal transmission to not be the same; Tilford cannot be considered a reference in the combination.

Applicant contends that because the foregoing argument overcomes Tilford as a reference, the base claim for which dependent claim 13 depends is in condition for allowance. Claim 13 incorporates all of the distinct limitations of Independent Claim 12; it is allowable for at least the reasons articulated in support of Claim 12. More importantly, Dykes cannot render Claim 13 obvious without Tilford in the combination.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments submitted herein and the above comments, it is believed that all grounds of rejection are overcome and that the application is placed in full condition for allowance. Should there be any further questions or reservations, Examiner is urged to telephone Applicant's undersigned attorney at (330) 253-5678.

Respectfully submitted,

OCT-29-2007 05:10 From:

To: 9,15712738300

Page: 6/6

**Utility Patent
Ser. No. 09/921,375**

John D. Gugliotta, P.E., Esq.
Registration No. 36,538
Park One Center
6100 Oak Tree Blvd.
Suite 200
Independence, OH 44131
Ph: (330) 659-0065